

**AGENDA FOR
CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS' "NOON" MEETING
MONDAY, MAY 15, 2000
Immediately Following Director's Meeting
CONFERENCE ROOM 113**

I. MINUTES

1. Director's Minutes for May 8, 2000.
2. Minutes of "Noon" Council Members' Meeting of May 8, 2000.

II. COUNCIL REPORTS ON BOARDS, COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS AND CONFERENCES

1. Public Building Commission (Camp/Seng)
2. ISPC Meeting (Fortenberry)
3. Board of Health (Johnson)
4. Multicultural Advisory Committee (McRoy)
5. Concert/Entertainment Task Force Meeting (McRoy)
6. Antelope Valley Advisory Committee (Seng)
7. Lincoln Partnership for Economic Development Meeting (Seng)
8. Certificate Review Committee Meeting (Shoecraft)
9. Parks & Rec. Advisory Board Meeting (Shoecraft)

OTHER MEETINGS REPORTS:

III. APPOINTMENTS/REAPPOINTMENTS - NONE

IV. MEETINGS/INVITATIONS

1. Alternative Business Systems, L.L.C. - Cordially invites you to attend our Open House on Thursday, May 18, 2000 from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. at 5005 Russell Circle - RSVP to 464-0555 by May 15th - Admission is free - Lunch will be served - Door Prizes, Entertainment (See Invitation).

2. You are cordially invited to the Open House and Ribbon Cutting Ceremony for the newly renovated GOAL Computer Learning Center. This celebration is the culmination of the Capital Campaign undertaken by the Seniors Foundation in 1998 to establish and renovate two sites serving older adults wanting to learn about computers. On Tuesday, May 16, 2000 from 7:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. at the GOAL Computer Learning Centers, Lincoln Downtown Senior Center Site, 1005 "O" St., 2nd Floor - A light breakfast will be available (See Invitation).
3. 3rd Annual Great Plains Symposium - Featuring Contemporary Civil Rights Issues - Presented by City of Lincoln-Commission on Human Rights on Friday, July 21, 2000 at the Cornhusker Hotel, 333 S. 13th Street - \$50.00 per person for Registration Fee - RSVP by July 10, 2000 (See Invitation).
4. You are invited to recognize & celebrate Survival Skills Youth enrolled in the Spring, 2000 session - Go For The Gold: It's Your Future - On Saturday, May 13, 2000 at the Lincoln Woman's Club, 407 South 14th Street (just north of the State Capitol) - 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. (See Invitation for schedule of events).
5. Reba Schafer's Retirement Party - A Reception on Friday, May 19, 2000 from 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. - at the Lincoln Downtown Senior Center, 1005 "O" Street (See Invitation).
6. Public Works & Utilities Advisory - Arterial Rehabilitation 56th Street from Holdrege to Cleveland Streets - Invited to a public informational meeting regarding the scheduled rehabilitation of 56th Street from Holdrege to Cleveland Streets on Monday, May 22, 2000 from 4:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. at Brownell Elementary School in the Multi-Media Room, 6000 Aylesworth Ave. (See Advisory).
7. The Board of Directors of DayWatch invites you to a reception honoring Bil Roby, Departing Executive Director, and welcoming Alan Green, New Executive Director - Tuesday, May 23rd, 2000 - 4:00 p.m. to 6 p.m. at the home of Terry and Mary Werner - 3483 Anaheim Drive (North of 35th and South Streets)

8. Public Works Advisory - Arterial Rehabilitation "A" Street from Eastridge Drive to 66th Street. - Thursday, May 25th, 2000 from 4:30 to 5:00 p.m. at the Holy Trinity Episcopal Church - 6001 "A" Street. (Enter from the East side of the Church)

V. COUNCIL MEMBERS

VI. REQUESTS OF COUNCIL FROM MAYOR - NONE

VII. MISCELLANEOUS

1. Request from Jon Camp to Discuss the Council Funding for 2000-2001 City Budget.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES
City Council Members “Noon” Meeting
Monday, May 15, 2000
Conference Room 113

Council Members Present: Coleen Seng, Chair; Jeff Fortenberry; Vice-Chair; Jon Camp, Jonathan Cook, Cindy Johnson, Annette McRoy, Jerry Shoecraft; **ABSENT:** None

Others Present: Ann Harrell, Jennifer Brinkman, Mayor’s Office; Dana Roper, City Attorney; Kathleen Sellman, Planning Director; Don Herz, Finance Director; Steve Hubka, Budget Director; Mark Hunzeker, Attorney; Darrell Podany, Aide to Council Member Camp; Tammy Bogenreif, Council Staff; and Chris Hain, *Lincoln Journal Star* Representative.

I. MINUTES

1. Director’s Minutes for May 8, 2000.
2. Minutes of “Noon” Council Members’ Meeting of May 8, 2000.

Ms. Seng, Council Chair, requested a motion to approve the above-listed minutes. Jon Camp moved approval of the minutes, as presented. The motion was seconded by Annette McRoy and carried by the following vote: **AYES:** Jon Camp, Jonathan Cook, Jeff Fortenberry, Cindy Johnson, Annette McRoy, Coleen Seng, Jerry Shoecraft; **NAYS:** None.

II. COUNCIL REPORTS ON BOARDS, COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS AND CONFERENCES

1. **PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION (Camp/Seng)** Ms. Seng reported that she had requested that a green sign be placed in the 2nd Floor hallway outside the Mayor’s Office that would direct the Public into the Mayor’s Conference Room. She noted that people are always going into Planning asking where the Mayor’s Conference Room is. It seems to be a room utilized a great deal by the Public. She hoped a sign would be placed soon.

She reported that regarding the day the Fire Alarm had been sounded, there was a volunteer at the Information Desk who was in a wheel chair and could not get out of the front door - so PBC will be looking at that situation. Though the building is meeting the ADA standards, the wheels were getting caught, prohibiting her exit Ms. Seng thanked Mr. Fortenberry for helping the woman out of the building.

Ms. Seng reported that the Commission had engaged in a lot of discussion on the recent Open House for the two government buildings. She continued, noting that they had discussed the art work in front of the Hall of Justice [The Rail Joiner] and the Penny Drive. Several of the Public Building Commission members had already been thinking about trying to do something with the Penny drive on a yearly basis...it had been successful and a good way for the children to be included in a City project. The Art Committee may be following through on that.

The commemorative Plaque that will be hanging in the Hall of Justice was reviewed - they tried to make sure that everyone's name was spelled correctly. The years of service for each public official will not be shown on the plaque after it was decided that the year begin-end format made it look like someone had died. The architectural firm is donating that plaque to the City.

Ms. Seng requested Mr. Roper to make a few brief comments on the brochure displays at the Information Desk. Mr. Roper indicated the issue had been raised as to whether when a "good" group comes in wanting to leave their brochures at the Information Desk, they can or not. The problem, of course, is that this would create a public forum where one did not exist. Then, if a less desirable group decides that they want to leave their brochure at the Desk, having opened this up as a public forum, the City would not be able to say no.

This gets back to what the State of Missouri ran into under their "Adopt a Highway Program". One of the groups that wanted to adopt a highway was the Ku Klux Klan. The State of Missouri had some "heartburn" about putting up a government sign saying "This highway has been adopted by the Ku Klux Klan". That case went all the way to the Eighth Circuit Court. The group qualified for the program, since it's been opened up to the public; the rules have to be the same for everyone. The problem is that for every one of the "good" groups that want to leave their literature, we must remember that there could be groups that the City would not want to endorse by allowing literature distribution. That is the reason the rule that was adopted states that there is no literature allowed to be distributed in City Hall in the common area. Ms. Seng asked if Council would see something coming forward on that. Mr. Roper noted that it was just adopted as a Building Commission Rule, so that should take care of the issue for the time being.

Ms. McRoy noted that she had lost her parking tag and Ms. Seng suggested she contact Don Killeen and request a new one. Mr. Shoecraft stated that Ms. Bogenreif had helped him get another tag. Ms. Bogenreif stated that she could get another tag for Ms. McRoy.

Mr. Camp reported that the PBC did pass the master bid that will allow all the various agencies to subscribe contractors for minor jobs which would be a more cost effective process.

Ms. Seng commented that there was a \$62,000 refund on the new furniture purchase for the Hall of Justice; so Mr. Killeen is getting that broken down into County and City percentage amounts and the money will be applied to the furniture budget of each entity. Mr. Camp emphasized that this would be additional monies for those budgets.

2. ISPC (Fortenberry) Mr. Fortenberry was unable to attend the meeting.

3. BOARD OF HEALTH (Johnson) Ms. Johnson reported that there were two new Board Members: Dr. Ed Schneider and Randy Ross; they're already offering great input. We had an election of officers. Jim Ganser is the new Chair of the Health Board. She noted that he would be meeting with the new members to get them up to speed on some of the Board's policies and new procedures.

She stated that they had received the normal report from Leon Vinci about what is going on in the Health Department, noting that everything was fine there. She added that

what the Board did do was discuss an assessment of the Board as well as where they'd like to go. There was a five question self-assessment list based on questions Peter Druker has set up for non-profit organizations that will allow us to take a look at the different areas of the Health Department as well as the Board. That was discussed.

Ms. Johnson stated that she had to leave shortly after this point in the meeting, but Ms. Brinkman was in attendance and she had stated that animal control had been discussed. Ms. Brinkman reported that the Board just followed up on the conversation they'd had the month before outlining that they had disbanded the animal services subcommittee and that they intended to have a public hearing. Ann Seacrest suggested that they break that public hearing into two different sections. They anticipate that at the June Board meeting, they'll have a public hearing and will invite all of the members that were on the animal services subcommittee to come and give a presentation on how they view animal services.

But what they really want to accomplish is to see what services are being provided in Lincoln now. Then they could look at whether or not there was duplication of services or where there might be services that are not being offered right now. So, in addition to the presentations, they will also open up, through the news media, to ask the public to attend as well. They thought they'd have the meeting somewhere other than the Health Department, with the Council Chambers or NETV being two suggested locations. The Health Department is working on putting that together. Ms. Brinkman noted that the Board saw this as Step One.

Ms. Brinkman stated then at the July meeting, they proposed Step Two, which would be discussion of what the Board of Health's role really is as far as making this determination [regarding animal control]. What does the Board really want to see. Ms. Brinkman noted that a lot of the questions coming out of the Board of Health that she has heard are "Does this really fit into our priority of how we should be spending dollars at the Health Department?" She commented that some of the Board Members think that public Health dollars should be spent, not on animal services, but on other programs.

Ms. Johnson thanked Ms. Brinkman for this re-cap of the meeting.

4. MULTICULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (McRoy) Ms. McRoy did not attend this meeting. She commented that they were just going to discuss the new affirmative action officer. When Ms. Glass was appointed Personnel Director, she had also been made the Affirmative Action Officer. Now, in the intervening months, the Mayor's Office and Ms. Glass have realized that she cannot do both, so now there will be a separate position. Ms. McRoy thought that the Mayor was going to announce that, so she did not attend the meeting.

Mr. Shoecraft stated that he thought, regarding the Affirmative Action position, that the job can be done by Larry Williams [Human Right Director]. He stated that he honestly believed that. He did not think that the Human Rights Office was that busy to where the City should go out and have a separately funded position for that job. Mr. Shoecraft stated that he believed Mr. Williams could and should handle that position. He stated that he realized that Ms. Glass was so busy that she couldn't do it, but he believed that the Human Rights Office should have the position of Affirmative Action Officer under its jurisdiction.

Mr. Williams could be doing that in line with his other duties. Mr. Shoecraft stated that, in his opinion, over the years the history of that office would indicate that it is not that busy.

Ms. Brinkman stated that she would relay Mr. Shoecraft's comments to the Mayor. She believed that what the Mayor tried to briefly outline in the budget briefings last week is that his office was trying to respond to some concerns from the MAC about the situation. She noted that the MAC saw Human Rights as an enforcement organization separate from the affirmative action program. So, that's how Administration has moved forward with it. She did indicate that she would take it back and it would be discussed. MAC will have a retreat in June to talk about what kind of things they want to accomplish and what function they see the Committee as playing.

Ms. Brinkman also reported that Judy Morgan resigned from the MAC, so they will be trying to come forward with someone to fill that position. She was the Chair, so Thomas Christy will fill in until we find someone. It was noted that Ms. Morgan resigned because of her busy schedule with the Indian Affairs Commission and commitments with other issues on the national level, she just doesn't have the time she feels should be devoted to MAC.

Mr. Shoecraft noted that Mr. Ed Wimes, when he worked as an Aide to the Mayor handled the Affirmative Action position, and did it very well, in conjunction with his other duties. Mr. Shoecraft noted that he saw no reason, since the Human Right Commission is under the Mayor's Office, why Mr. Williams can't do both. He's been introduced to the community and is there for the enforcement issues. Mr. Shoecraft felt that Mr. Williams is competent enough to handle some out-reach and internal processes and the duties of an Affirmative Action officer.

5. CONCERT/ENTERTAINMENT TASK FORCE (McRoy) Ms. McRoy stated that the Task Force has just about wrapped up its business. She commented that she can't wait...she's tired of it. She started with the venue committee, and helped establish their focus and direction which they wanted to expand. Now they want to delay their report because some of the members feel it was not inclusive enough. So, there is some work yet to be done.

Mr. Shoecraft asked why the Task Force thought the process had not been inclusive enough. Ms. McRoy explained that they had limited the scope to include only the larger venues such as Pershing and the Lied Center, etc. Ms. McRoy stated that some members wanted to include every little place that had karaoke night, and the Zoo Bar, which holds what - five people? [Laughter] She noted that they wanted to advise Council on alcohol issues at Pinewood Bowl, and she, on behalf of the all the Council, took offense to that since she knew that Council had followed all the due processes in that situation.

6. ANTELOPE VALLEY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (Seng) Ms. Seng reported that they had held the shortest AVAC meeting in all of these many long years of meetings. One reason the meeting was so short was because one of the presenters was not in attendance. The Committee went through the public review process for Antelope Valley which will be coming before Council. Ms. Seng wanted Council to know that both the Environmental Impact Statement and the Corp of Engineers Feasibility Study should be out sometime this month. So, at some point there will be a public hearing for both of those studies. She hoped

that it would be included within a town hall meeting, most likely to be held at Lincoln High School. There will be a public comment time on both studies.

The Task Force did vote to require the JAVA Partners to enlarge the Citizens Group. What was voted in for JAVA was nine citizen members. There was a lot of discussion on this issue, so there will be a request coming forward from the three members of the JAVA group. Those three are Glen Johnson from NRD, Scott Lewis from the University of Nebraska and Allan Abbott from the City. Roger Figard has been named the project manager. That's basically what was accomplished at this last meeting. The next Advisory Committee meeting will be announced once the Environmental Impact Statement has been received.

Mr. Cook asked what the final decision on the Citizens group had been...wondering if it would remain nine members, or increase to nine members? Ms. Seng commented that the Advisory Committee could not make any decisions. Those three would have to make that final decision. Mr. Cook commented that ultimately, when we approve that decision, we could change that...so Council does have that power at the time of approval. Ms. Seng agreed that later on Council would have that power. Mr. Cook stated that he was comfortable with that decision as it was made at the time, but that was with the knowledge that we had another opportunity to address it. He commented that he had been at meetings where there had been some discussion about enlarging the group. Ms. Seng agreed that that will probably happen.

Mr. Cook stated that part of the issue is 'should JAVA itself appoint the members of the citizens committee, or should there be some outside entity making those appointments?' Ms. Seng stated that what they'd heard was that there was a letter coming out to all Advisory Committee members to see if they wanted to be a part of it. She stated that she had not yet received a letter.

7. LINCOLN PARTNERSHIP FORECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (Seng) Ms. Seng reported that this meeting was really THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BOARD MEETING. Ms. Seng reported that she attended the meeting on behalf of the Mayor since it was on his wedding day. Ms. Seng reported that she tried to tell a little about what the City is going through. She shared with Council some of the information she received at the Board Meeting, reporting that there has been a group that has been looking at a Sports Promotion Council which would be under the Chamber's authority. They're trying to raise enough dollars to make it a private group which would have a full-time effort.

Following that presentation, we heard a report from Bill Byrne from the University, asking everybody to begin considering a "Room Tax" to build an addition to the stadium. He talked a lot about football being the economic engine for all of the University's sports.

A short report on Pershing Auditorium study was also presented. A government affairs update was presented. Out of that, Ms. Seng noted that a lot of people were really worried about the I-80 Beautification Study.

Mr. Fortenberry stated that he hoped the rumors about this whole thing were not maliciously planted so as to disrupt the process. He hoped that this was just a

misunderstanding. This is just a plan as a point from which to start; it will, of course, require appropriate adjustments, then we can begin the process.

8. CERTIFICATE REVIEW COMMITTEE (Shoecraft) Mr. Shoecraft reported that they had met last Friday and developed the questions for the Rural interviews. We have about twenty questions. One group, called Common Questions will be combined with questions that are just targeted toward individual entities. There will be two hour interviews. They will be given about an hour to give their presentation; then about 15 - 20 minutes, plus of question/answers; then 15 minutes or so of summation.

The next meeting will be the presentations. They'll go in a specific order, which we did fairly by flipping a coin. So, they'll go in a specific order and move on from there. The only dilemma we may be facing is whether or not those four interviews will be open to the public? Can TV cameras and microphones be admitted? He stated that if he were giving a presentation of this importance, he personally would not want a TV camera and radio and microphones there. When your doing a presentation and/or interviewing, it would be very distracting, but that has yet to be determined. Mr. Herz stated that it has not been determined yet and the other issue is that the presenter who goes first would be at a disadvantage to those going after, if it were an open meeting.

Mr. Shoecraft thought that to avoid giving an unfair advantage to those coming after the first presentation, the presentations and interviews should be private. Knowing the questions and concerns of the committee prior to a presentation would give the last presenters an unfair advantage over those who present first. Mr. Shoecraft stated that he hoped that the presenters will be respectful of each other and would not insist on being present during the others' presentations.

All of the presentations will be done the same day. Mr. Shoecraft noted that Dana [Roper, City Attorney] had said regarding earlier selection and review committees on which Mr. Shoecraft has served, that the meetings were private and not open to the public.

Mr. Camp asked about the time-line that the Mayor had presented to Council. Mr. Shoecraft commented that this committee will be done by June 5th. Then the recommendations, or facts and findings, will be presented to the Mayor. Then all the information will come to Council. This will be scheduled for public hearing, tentatively, June 26th. The idea was to have a normal, 1:30 meeting with a very short agenda, just to handle business that would be absolutely necessary. Then adjourn and come back at 6:30 p.m. for the public hearing on this.

Mr. Cook had a comment stating that if we could control the agenda in order to make sure that the only items on there are liquor permits, and other items could be postponed one week, then simply have the 6:30 meeting set up for 20 minutes and then have the public hearing on the Certificate. That way, Council Members would not have to come in twice for meetings that day. It was decided that Council would confer with City Clerk Paul Malzer about making such agenda arrangements as may be determined at a later date. [*Council Meeting to be set for 5:30 p.m. on Monday, June 26th*]

Mr. Camp asked if this would be coming before Council in Resolution form, to which Mr Shoecraft responded that it does come in the form of a resolution.

9. PARKS & REC. ADVISORY BOARD (Shoecraft) Mr. Shoecraft ran copies of the proposed names for new City Parks so that Council Members could study and review the names and name selection process and some concerns regarding the process scenarios. There could be input and discussion of this at the next "Noon" Meeting.

Secondly, the Golf Committee wants to come and ask the City to reduce the water rates. They said they've used 80% of their funding already this year, which Mr. Shoecraft found hard to believe; but this comment was made at the Park & Rec Advisory Board meeting. He wondered if it was mis-management...he wondered what they were doing. Mr. Shoecraft stated to Mr. Hubka that they made the comment that they've used 80% of their funding already this year for water, so they want a reduction in the water rates! Mr. Hubka noted that it has been dry, but he didn't realize that it was that dry!

The last thing they reported was that the City is up 6% compared to last year for the April -Year-to-Date in the rounds ; 28% increase in revenues; and at the Jim Ager course, it was up 16%.

OTHER MEETINGS - None

III. APPOINTMENTS/REAPPOINTMENTS -None

IV. MEETINGS/INVITATIONS - Noted Without Comment.

V. COUNCIL MEMBERS

JON CAMP - No Further Comments

JONATHAN COOK - No Further Comments

JEFF FORTENBERRY - No Further Comments

CINDY JOHNSON - No Further Comments

ANNETTE McROY - No Further Comments

COLEEN SENG - Ms. Seng commented on the Cookie Fund. It was discussed briefly and \$20.00 was collected.

JERRY SHOECRAFT - No Further Comments

ANN HARRELL - No Further Comments

JENNIFER BRINKMAN - No Further Comments

DANA ROPER - No Further Comments

VI. REQUESTS OF COUNCIL FROM MAYOR - NONE

VII. MISCELLANEOUS -

1. Request from Jon Camp to Discuss the Council Funding for 2000-2001 City Budget.

Ms. McRoy asked if, since a concern of Mr. Camp 's had been the difficulty he had trying to do note taking during the Budge Meetings, if it would be appropriate for Mr. Podany to sit in at the meetings to take notes so Mr. Camp could focus on the presentations. Mr. Camp felt this would be a breech in the confidentiality consideration. Ms. McRoy noted that Mr. Podany was considered Staff. Mr. Camp thought if copies of the over-heads could be made available, it would be helpful due to the over-load of information being presented.

Mr. Camp noted that in the big picture, Council is trying to work in a collaborative manner to comment on the budget and try to work together so we don't get into big problems down the road in this process.

Ms. Seng stated that that was what that list of items was for...the Mayor was asking for input from Council on those items. She commented that that is usually what is done. Mr. Camp stated that he did not understand the resistance to his request for a written outline of the budget items for review and notation during the presentations.

Ms. Seng asked if there were other items for discussion. Mr. Camp stated that the second point he raised in his memo is the Council Office Budget. He would like a sense of where the other Council members were on the increase in the Travel/Consultant Fund and in Staff. He felt the increased amount he had suggested was appropriate to allow the Council members of a growing City to responsibly handle their duties to the public. He felt they needed adequate staffing funding to do that and stated that he did not believe Council currently had that funding.

Ms. Seng asked if anyone wanted to respond to Mr. Camp's remarks.

Mr. Shoecraft commented that he wanted to respectfully state to all of the Council Members that he realized there was probably not a consensus on this and there is probably not total agreement, and he stated that he was not against everything that was said, but his comment would be that considering the budget constraints that are present this year and in view of the fact that those constraints will undoubtedly be in place next year as well, he thought it would be inappropriate to increase the Council's budget by \$180,000.00.

He stated that he knew that one of the big concerns the public has about this position [membership on Council] is that it only pays \$12,000.00 per year compared to \$2[9],000.00 per year paid to County Board Members. So it has always been said that this doesn't allow *all* the people to run for this office, because it doesn't pay enough. Another thing Mr. Shoecraft has heard is that those members of the Council who have outside jobs [in order to support themselves and their families] are saying we can't do our [Council] jobs because we need more resources and there are time constraints. Mr. Shoecraft has concerns about these issues. He stated that he would rather that the public give him an increase to \$20,000.00 per year [in salary] and that would allow him to go to a part-time job so that he could devote more time to Council business and do a better job for his constituents rather than increasing the Council budget to \$180,000.00 per year. He explained that over a four-year period an increase in Council salaries from \$12,000 to \$20,000 per year would

amount to approximately \$224,000.00. This would allow more people to run for the office; it would allow current members to go to part-time jobs and still have time to do a better job for our constituents. This would be versus a \$180,000.00 per year out-lay over a four year period which would total \$720,000.00 by which we would be asking the taxpayer to increase the funding for the City Council office alone.

Mr. Shoecraft stated that in the beginning he had been receptive to this idea, but looking at the budget constraints we are now working under, he stated that his personal opinion is that this is inappropriate. He did not want to create a government within a government. He stated that when Council members ran for this office, we knew what we getting into, knew how much time the job required. When running for this office, one either runs for the right reasons, or one runs for this office for the wrong reasons. If it means pulling up your sleeves and going out and looking at sites and get to work - do it. If you don't have time to serve on City Council, don't run for City Council. When all seven of us made the decision to run, we knew what it paid and we knew how much time it takes to do the job.

He stated that someday Council could do some changes that might help us do our jobs better, but the way the budget constraints are at this time, and with the State lid, he was not about to increase the City Council budget by \$180,000.00. He noted that last year at the close of the budget process, they had had to take away funds from several programs to meet the 0% tax increase they had desired. He admitted that he had been a part of that process, but he warned Council not to ask him to ever do that again and then ask him to increase the Council's own budget by \$180,000.00. He stated that he could not and would not do it.

He stated that he does not want power or notoriety....he just wants to do his job. When he is not elected, or decides not to run again, that will be the way it ends. The next person will come up and, hopefully, do a good job and have the time to serve and maybe the pay will be increased to allow them the time to serve; but he stated that he would not create a government within a government. He stated that Lincoln operates within a City Charter under a strong-mayor form of government. Unless the Charter is changed, he did not see that Council should be adding all these positions to the Council office because all we'd be doing is creating a government within a government. He stated that the budget picture is somewhat scary and those Police Officers do deserve raises, absolutely. Mr. Shoecraft stated that he submitted these comments respectfully to his friend, but he could not support this.

Mr. Camp said that he appreciated Mr. Shoecraft's comments noting that they were well stated. He explained that he was looking at the issue differently. He gave the analogy of taking a car engine and running it on a low-octane fuel vs. a high octane fuel. You get more mileage out of the high octane fuel. The net cost is less, too. He sees Council as just lagging along. *You* know the volumes of information that Council has to respond to...it's not a matter of time, it's not a matter of power or position; it's a matter of doing the best thing for the community. In that budget, Mr. Camp felt there were transfers that could be made in personnel that could make up part of that funding. We can work better with those positions in place. He stated that through the more efficient working that we can do, we can actually save the taxpayers money. That is the spirit in which he makes this proposal. We're running on the low octane fuel and sputtering along and not doing as good a job as we could otherwise do for the community. He felt this was something that Council needed to do.

He noted that times change and the City grows, technology changes. There is so much more that

we could be accomplishing. As a business person, you get the tools that help you do; you don't just sit idle. That is the kind of environment that we're in.

Discussion continued with concerns expressed about increasing the burden to taxpayers with this increase being rebutted with comments that the monies could be found by shifting the funds within the budget.

Ms. Seng dismissed Ms. Sellman who had come to the meeting for discussion on the 84th and Waverly Road development since the item would be placed on Pending for two weeks. She then made remarks to Mr. Camp regarding his proposal. She noted that she would hope that there will be some additional dollars put in to the City Council Budget for another Staff person, so that there is someone in addition to the current two-members on Staff. She felt this would give additional support to each Council member as well as relieving Staff. She commented that she believed the Mayor had indicated that he would do that, So money for that position would be placed in the Mayor's Budget. She stated that she had checked with Steve Hubka on that and there was funding for an additional person in the Council Office.

Mr. Hubka stated that there was *not* funding for an additional person in the Council Office, but there was an increase from \$5,000.00 each to \$6,000.00 each in the Council Members Research/Consultant funds.

Ms. Seng stated that funding for an additional staff position was one thing that she thought the Mayor had indicated to Council would be done. Mr. Hubka stated that the Mayor may have said something, but those dollars have not been put in place in the budget. Ms. Seng stated that she would personally like to see one additional person placed in the Council Office so there would be three people on Staff rather than two.

Mr. Fortenberry thought it might be important to define more clearly that particular role if it is the consensus of the Council, to ensure that that person will not be purely administrative, but if that's where we end up, the position would also tie in with policy, research and these types of things. Maybe if we find some middle ground for Staff, for some of the concerns that Council members have raised, as well as the competing concern of budget.

Mr. Shoecraft commented that if Council did add a position, it should be no position higher than what Tammy and Joan are doing....no \$60,000-\$80,000 per year position that turns into a political position. And, out of respect for Joan and Tammy, it should not be someone coming in who would now be in charge of them - they would never have any stepping stone to advance to another level.

Ms. McRoy stated that Council could promote one of them and bring someone in at a lower-paying entry position. That would be even better. Mr. Shoecraft stated that that is what he would expect for the two current staff members. Ms. McRoy agreed.

Mr. Cook stated that Council must also consider what their individual budget amounts are for. He noted that the money is for research, which is fine...if we want to use it for staff and constituent services, is it appropriate to set aside that much or might a portion of that be set aside for this new position, if the new position can handle a lot of these things for the Council members on a day-to-day basis.

After further discussion on the \$5,000.00 individual budgets, it was determined that they be left the same at \$5,000.00. Mr. Camp noted that here we are discussing a few thousand dollars when we just approved \$200,000 for the consultant for cable TV. There are amounts in the budget that

can be adjusted. I'm asking for funds to allow Council to do its job effectively. He stated that he could not understand why they were handcuffing themselves in constituent relations. He suggested moving the ombudsman out of the Mayor's Office and into the Council in order to deal directly with the people. That would add no cost to the budget for that position.

Ms. Seng turned the meeting over to Vice-Chair Fortenberry so that she could leave and prepare for the upcoming Council meeting.

Mr. Cook wanted to note, regarding the \$200,000.00 consulting fee which was an issue today that will be put off for a bit, but that is why it is very important that Council stick to their guns on the reimbursement of Consultant fees from the franchisee. They are the ones who stand to make an enormous amount of money. Mr. Cook stated that he did not want the City to spend \$200,000 out of the City Budget to pay for consultants when, in fact, the Code says the franchisee is supposed to pay and they're just trying to get out of that responsibility. There are some big sums in the budget that are very important to us.

Mr. Fortenberry commented that, back to the other issue, when he first joined the Council and was hit with the overwhelming amount of information and had difficulty, Mayor Johanns has said that Mr. Fortenberry would find that it calms down after a time. But Mr. Fortenberry commented, it never really has; the City has changed and the complexity of the issues, as everyone agrees, is greater. He, therefore, did not think it was inappropriate to be having discussion on how the Council should be evolving to meet those changing needs. He has really appreciated the opportunity to have a little supplement in the budget to get the small things done quickly to be able to focus on the bigger things. And that has gone a long way, but he requested that Council members all just think about this a little longer and try to get everyone on the same page within the next few weeks.

Mr. Cook commented that there should be closer interaction with the Mayor's Office on the Ombudsman position...whether that position is shared, or Council has a position in the office that interacts more closely with the Ombudsman. Mr. Cook stated that it is easier to make phone calls to department heads or directors to try to find things out, because RFI's may take forever to process. If someone was following up on those more directly, and gave Mr. Cook more direct feed-back, he could then call up and ask for better follow-up. He noted that the Mayor's Office could do that easily, and there may not be a need for a new position, but more cooperation. He did not want the Ombudsman position in the Council Office.

Mr. Camp commented that that is the way it was supposed to have been working, but it has not. The manner in which those RFI processes are supposed to be operating is not the way they are working. That's what he has had to do with Mr. Podany, sending him to talk directly with the Directors and Staff.

Mr. Fortenberry requested a re-visitation to these issues in two weeks.

Mr. Camp commented on four ordinances that he would request be placed on Pending to investigate the possible consequences further before proceeding with them. Council had discussion on these budget ordinances relating to the City Pension fund with questions addressed to Mr. Hubka. The discussion continued as the Council members left the meeting room.

VIII. MEETING ENDED - Approximately 1:25 p.m.